

**RESPONSE**

The Undersigned thanks the Examiner for his time on December 13, 2010 and the opportunity to discuss this case and the pending office action. During the telephone interview the Examiner indicated that claims which further specified that component (B)(1) is present at about 2 percent by weight, would be very likely to be found allowable over the cited references in light of the data included in the application as filed and the subsequently filed declarations.

The Examiner further indicated that if such an amendment were made, the current feature in the claims specifying the range of weight percents for the combination of components (B)(1) and (B)(2) would no longer be needed and could be removed.

Based on this interview, Applicants have amended claim 1 to specify that component (B)(1) is present in the claimed composition at about 2 percent by weight. Support for this amendment is found in the specification as filed on pages 20 and 21. Specifically, Example 6, which is an inventive example, contains 2 percent by weight of component (B)(1), as well as 7.4 percent by weight of component (B)(2). Footnote h, on page 21 of the specification also notes that the (B)(1) component is present at 2 percent by weight.

Applicants note that page 22, lines 10 to 13 of the specification indicates that all numerical values in the specification are understood to be modified by the word "about". The sentence does goes on to say that values included with examples are not so modified but Applicants believe it is well taken that this only indicates amounts listed for the examples are the actual, exact amounts used, and that such values are still modified by the term "about" when it comes to the general teaching they provide as part of the overall specification.

In addition Applicants have removed the language from the claims that specified that the combination of (B)(1) and (B)(2) was 5.5 to 15 percent by weight. Applicants have also moved the language that specifies the amount of (B)(3) present in the composition from the end of the claim to the section on (B)(3).

No other elements of the claims have been changed.

Applicants respectfully submit that, for the reasons discussed with the Examiner on December 13, 2010, and in light of Applicants' previous submissions, the present claims are novel and non-obvious over the cited references and the current rejections (discussed in detail in Applicants previous response, incorporated here by reference) should be removed.

Conclusion.

For the foregoing reasons it is submitted that the present claims are novel and unobvious over the cited reference, and in condition for allowance. The foregoing remarks are believed to be a full and complete response to the outstanding office action. Therefore an early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that only minor issues remain to be resolved, a telephone call to the Undersigned is suggested.

Any required fees or any deficiency or overpayment in fees should be charged or credited to deposit account 12-2275 (The Lubrizol Corporation).

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher D. Hilker #58,510/

Phone: (440) 347-4231  
Telefax: (440) 347-1110

The Lubrizol Corporation  
29400 Lakeland Blvd.  
Wickliffe, OH 44092-2298

Christopher D. Hilker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 58,510